

**ACEC – INDOT  
BRIDGE INSPECTION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING NO. 9 MINUTES**

May 11, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Mike Cox. Those in attendance were:

Jim Mickler	INDOT, Greenfield District
James Yapp	INDOT, Greenfield District
Gerald Nieman	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Bill Dittrich	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Brian Harvey	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Stephanie Yager	IACC
Bill Williams	IACHES, Monroe County Engineer
Michael Cox	Beam, Longest and Neff, L.L.C.
Mike Obergfell	USI Consultants, Inc.
Mary Anne O'Toole	Collins Engineers, Inc.
John Ashton	Collins Engineers, Inc.
Jennifer Hart	RQAW
Erich Hart	RQAW
Drew Storey	InspectTech
Jon Sera	Butler, Fairman and Seufert, Inc.

A meeting agenda had previously been distributed and the following items were discussed:

1. Mike Cox started off the meeting with a brief overview of the agenda.
2. The minutes of the previous meeting were discussed. A few minor corrections were requested. The corrected minutes were redistributed following the meeting. The group was given two weeks to finish reviewing the minutes before they will be posted on INDOT's website.
3. Mary Anne O'Toole discussed the progress of the Bridge Inspection Manual. Collins is currently performing a final run through of the manual. She will send out a notice when she has uploaded all of the revised chapters. She has received several comments from reviewers that did not like specific photos. She has requested better photos from those individuals. Mike Obergfell questioned the need for in-depth channel cross-sections for an initial inspection. Bill mentioned that some requirements may have to be taken into account during the next inspection contract cycle due to lack of funds. Bill stated that inspectors would at least need to take soundings at the upstream and downstream copings. Jim Mickler questioned Part 1 Chapter 3. He asked if the initial inspection team leader is responsible for the underwater inspection, post-tension survey, or the maintenance and inspection manual. Bill stated that the team leader needs to create a timeline in their plan-of-action for getting all the requirements done. Bill added that it is very hard to get a contract put together to address these issues as they pop up. There needs to be some flexibility and willingness to get supplements. Bill asked Mary Anne to add some flexibility to these requirements. Gerald noted that a county is required to have the initial inspection complete within 180 days of the bridge being opened to traffic. A plan-of-action needs to be developed by that time that takes into account the

logistic limitation of the site. Jim Mickler asked if there was a need to put the bat and swallow chapter in the manual. He noted that as of this time this is only a requirement on state owned bridges. Jim also asked about railroad overpasses and their fracture critical inspections. INDOT actually inventories and inspects the railroad overpasses. The group agreed that the inspector would be responsible for contacting the owner of the railroad overpass if a critical deficiency were found. Jim also asked about closed and under construction bridges. He asked if any changes needed to be made to the bridge data if a bridge was under construction. Bill Dittrich answered that all appropriate codes must be updated for the bridge being closed during construction. Mary Anne is going to change the layout of the closed bridge section of the manual to clarify the difference between under construction and permanently closed bridges. Mary Anne is wrapping up all the corrections to the Inspection Manual. She did note that she is expecting much more comments once QC/QA policy goes into affect. There is no plan to print hard copies of the manual. There will be a web address for the latest version available.

4. Mike Cox discussed the Load Rating Chapter finalization. He recently sent an e-mail to the Midwest Working Group to poll other states on how to handle load ratings. He is concerned with the transition from one consultant to the next. The last paragraph from the load rating policy has been removed. Bill Dittrich wants to get Keith Hoernschemeyer to review and comment on this chapter. The group then discussed truss load ratings. The manual currently states that gusset plates shall be load rated, whereas the recent technical advisory says shall be analyzed. The group decided that a statement should be added to this section of the manual. The statement should say that the load rating engineer shall use engineering judgment to determine if Gusset plates should be load rated based on other conditions of the bridge. The group discussed how to attach load ratings to each bridge or county in InspectTech. Several of the consultants did not want to break the load ratings out by individual bridges.
5. The group discussed gusset plate measurements using non-destructive testing. Several in the group were concerned with increased costs associated with the equipment and training if required. The FHWA Technical Advisory dated January 29<sup>th</sup> of this year with its recommendations will be added to the manual.
6. The group then discussed Part 2, Chapter 7 of the manual concerning unknown foundations. Bill stated that a plan of action needs to be developed for all structures with unknown foundations. He did note that counties have been doing a good job eliminating unknown foundations. The group agreed that a memo should be developed to make everyone aware of major changes in procedure and new requirements from the inspection manual. Bill stated that recently a memo was developed to make INDOT inspectors aware of the QC/QA implementation. Bill also noted that InspectTech will need to be revised for the QC/QA procedures. The group agreed that the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the QC/QA will be a learning period. After reviewing QC/QA documents most inspectors should be aware of requirements that they will be marked up for.
7. The group discussed several items from the InspectTech task force meeting. Several of the consultants don't like that the data is partially in lower case and partially in all capital letters. Bill Dittrich stated that all counties need to be the same. Drew Storey felt that InspectTech would be able to go back and recapitalize everything and may also be able to lock input to all capital letters. The consultants

also felt that the add/delete forms were no longer necessary. Bill would like to wait a year before determining if this form can be removed. The group questioned what could be included in Item 75. It doesn't appear that much could be included in other structural work – local forces. Recent instructions are that the bridge must be eligible for federal funds to be able to input recommend repairs in Item 75. INDOT is currently looking into an input pull down for preventative maintenance items. The group then discussed the need to be able to prioritize bridges in the summary tables. Most would like to see one of the options Drew displayed as part of the work in the INDOT contract. The group also discussed the ability to send out helpful hints through the in.bridges website. Many in the group felt that a quarterly news report with helpful hints was a good idea.

8. The group then discussed how the Inspection Manual will be maintained. It was suggested that this be done in a similar fashion to the Design Manual. It is updated quarterly with highlights of the most current revisions.

The next meeting for the ACEC - INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. Thursday, July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010, at the Indianapolis Sub-district .

Individuals are invited to comment on items presented in these minutes and/or submit additional topics for discussion at the next meeting. Please E-mail comments to Jon Sera at [jsera@bfsengr.com](mailto:jsera@bfsengr.com).

This meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Butler, Fairman, and Seufert, Inc.